

PATENT
IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0033US2

REMARKS

Status:

Claims 1 - 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious in view of the teaching of US Pat. No. 6,058,389 to Chandra et al., considered in view of the teaching of US Pat. No. 5,857,180 to Hallmark et

Claims 1-17 are presented for reconsideration as explained in the discussion below.

Discussion:

First, considering the Chandra teaching, it appears that, at the last paragraph of col. 19 and the first paragraph of col. 20, there is discussed multi-customer access of a queue using an index structure. In the SQL excerpt that follows these respective implementation discussion paragraphs, there is included lock logic (update skip locked) to control access. This is the prior art Applicant acknowledges (See Applicant's specification at page 6 last paragraph extending to page 7 line15).

Applicant has recognized that by so timing the application of the index key to a message, that it is present just after the message is committed, the index key can act as an implicit commit flag (Applicant's specification, page 20, lines 1-4). The initialized index key does not trigger the get-wait request. The actual index key is in a range to trigger the request. Hence by timing the writing of the indcx key application, it works as an implicit flag using the already in-place request logic to provide timing without the overhead of a lock which must be set, detected and reset.

PATENT
IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0033US2

It is believed that the claims (e.g. claim1 at line 3) emphasize the assigning of the index key **in response to commit** (the commit that places the message on the queue). This is the advantageous timing that Applicant has recognized serves to reduce processing overhead. Only index keys for messages put on the queue provide a match because of Applicant's timing of the assignment in response to commit. Or, as the whereby of claim 1 states, "the index key assigned to the message in response to said commit provides an index which is usable for identifying committed messages having the particular application-specified attribute value" (bolding added for emphasis).

This timing of assignment is not believed to be taught in the prior art; and, indeed, it appears the Chandra teaching, with its lock approach, actually teaches away from Applicants improvement.

In accordance with the foregoing, it is believed this case is in condition for a notice of allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



George E. Grosser

Reg. No. 25,629

c/o
IBM Corp.
Dept. T81/Bldg. 503 PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

(919)968-7847
Fax 919-254-4330
EMAIL: gegch@prodigy.net